



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

application to each and every one of the resembling objects which would constitute it the name of a class. For this reason it can hardly be regarded as a true name at all, even though it be applicable, like a proper name, to only one object; for in this case the sound of the word is associated with the single object in no other way than that which determines all other mental associations. But the same laws which would determine such an association would also associate the representations of resembling objects, and would direct the attention more or less definitely to their points of resemblance, and thus store the memory with generalized pictures of experience, from which would spontaneously flow such simple inferences as the actions of the higher brute animals seem, at least, to imply. And all this could take place without the instrumentality of language, or any distinct consciousness of signs, or of their significance as such.

5. — *Modern Philology: its Discoveries, History, and Influence.* By BENJAMIN W. DWIGHT. First Series. Third Edition, revised and corrected. 8vo. pp. 360. Second Series. pp. 554. New York: Charles Scribner. 1864.

THE first portion of this book was published about five years ago, and was at that time noticed in this journal. The remainder consists of essays which have appeared at various times in the "Bibliotheca Sacra," and are now republished with many corrections and additions. A book with such a title and on such a subject cannot fail of obtaining many readers among the increasing number who are interested in philological studies. But if we were asked whether this book will satisfy the wants of those who will turn to it for information, and whether it is thoroughly accurate and trustworthy, we should be obliged to say no, for reasons which we will here briefly set forth.

The title will, perhaps, mislead a little, as it is too inclusive. The book consists of five essays, of which one is on the History of Modern Philology. The others are on special topics, treated in the light of modern science, but no view is given of the subject of Philology as a whole, with its rules and methods set forth and illustrated. The first essay consists of an Historical Sketch of the Indo-European Languages. This is in the main good; the characteristics of the different languages are well brought out, and their relationship exhibited. But it is a great error to place the Scandinavian languages on the same level as the Dutch and Friesic, and class them as one of the divisions of the Low-German. The Scandinavian languages bear the same relation to

the Low-German that the High-German do. All are indeed connected, but the point of departure is different. No one would say that the English was as closely related to the Swedish as to the Dutch, or even as to the German. Yet it ought to be so with Dr. Dwight's arrangement. Still less can we agree with the author in the conclusions which he draws from the genealogical history of languages. He infers not only the unity of the race, but also the divine origin of language. Not of language as such, but of some full, complete tongue, which he holds was taught to man by his Creator. All grammatical analysis tends to reduce language to the simplest possible form of certain syllables, each indeed pregnant with meaning. These syllables, for some unknown reason, were fitted to express each its own idea, and the instinct of man decided on their use. In the sense that all instinct is divinely created, language is of divine origin. But would Dr. Dwight hold that the Deity first developed language from this primitive state to a more advanced and complex structure, and then taught it to man? We think that Max Müller is misrepresented, or at least misunderstood, by Dr. Dwight in what he says of language being the product of one master-mind. We have never supposed Müller to mean that language was really originated in any perfect state by one man, but that the first man, through whom language was developed, gave it a coloring and a form which it has ever retained. This seems to be a necessary conclusion from the supposition of the origin of the race from one individual; though what Müller considers the imprint of one mind we should prefer to regard as resulting from the necessity of nature.

The chapter on the History of Modern Philology is a very readable account of some of the modern workers in that field. A view of philology in France, and of its able representatives, would have rendered it much more complete. Grimm's Scale is somewhat imperfectly stated. It is difficult to understand it or the examples which are given, as no explanation is offered of the irregularities in applying it to the German.

Chapter III. treats of the science of Etymology. Etymology is not itself a science, but only a part and a branch of the great science of language. As such, it demands scientific treatment. It has been far too often treated in a very empirical way. We have etymologicons of the Romance languages which are the right thing, and we have the unfinished work of the Grimms in German. But in English there is as yet nothing of any account. All attempts there have been very unscientific. Most of them have been made with a certain theory of etymology, which the lexicon was intended to prove. In Latin and Greek, also, students have nothing of much worth readily accessible.

In this chapter, after some excellent remarks on Freund, Passow, and Webster, the author undertakes to lay down rules for guidance in etymological study. These are hardly full enough, and do not hit the point. The etymology of a language is to be obtained as far as possible from itself, before resort is had to other languages for explanation. The words of the language should first be arranged in groups, by putting together all of the same origin or of connected roots. Then endeavor should be made to ascertain whether all these sprang from one word, or whether there were several co-existent and co-ordinate words. The history of the use of these words should also be investigated, so as to find out at what time each was first used, and whether it was in the language originally, or was introduced from some other language. Those words which we can thus trace no farther should then be compared with similar words and groups of words in other languages, and we should thus find out to what other language they are most related, and then, going one step back and repeating the process, we may finally come to the original root or form of the word, and perhaps hit upon its ultimate idea. At the same time, all the additions to the word in the shape of prefixes and terminations should be carefully studied, and their origin traced in the same way. All changes in spelling, shortenings, omissions, and contractions should be exactly noted, and a foundation would then be laid for the study of the phonetic laws of the language. We lay great stress on ascertaining the time when each word was first used; for by this means many mistakes may be avoided. This can only be done by a thorough study of the literature. In English, for example, we have many words of Latin origin, but they were introduced at very different times and under very different circumstances. *Street* is a relic of the Roman occupation; *altar* we get through the Saxon, and it came in with the introduction of Christianity; *arms* and *armor* are only traced to the Norman Conquest; while many others were not introduced till the revival of letters after the Reformation, and some are of still more recent date.

Dr. Dwight approaches this subject again in his last chapter, on Comparative English Etymology. Here was a fine chance for a needed work. It would have been well to show why all previous attempts at English etymology had been on a wrong basis, and to lay down the true principles and methods which should be followed. This our author does not do. The essay is taken up partly with general statements applying in some degree to English as well as to other languages, which are interesting, but very trite and unworthy of place in a book of this kind, and partly with remarks on certain peculiarities in English etymology. No attempt is made to explain these peculiarities, and

thus no advantage is derived from their presentation. The mere facts are nearly all of them obvious to any one who has reflected at all upon the language; and unless there was some end to be gained by stating them, they might better have made place for something else. We notice also a certain looseness of statement, which indicates too much hastiness of judgment, and often a superficial scholarship. Thus, on page 314, Second Series, the author says, "From what a vast variety of sources comes the termination *ay* in English," and then adduces *play, bay, hay, stay, way, lay*, and other monosyllables, in most of which the so-called termination is an integral part of the root. In the same way, he might have said in how many ways we get the prefix *b*, and instanced all the words beginning with that letter.

It is also frequently said that an English word is derived from a German one. This is as bad as to derive the Latin from the Greek, which Dr. Dwight severely criticises. Yet he says that "Eng. *beard* comes from its German correspondent *bart*," and that *sail, hill, and had* are contracted derivatives of the German *segel, hügel, and gehabt, hatte*.

Toward the close of this chapter, it is remarked that "there are but few compound forms native to our language itself." These are said to consist of only two classes, — one of compounds of an adjective and a noun, or of two nouns, and the other of compounds chiefly adverbial, made with the preposition *at*. Does Dr. Dwight suppose that all our other compound words were either imported from other languages, or formed in imitation of other languages? But this latter supposition implies a capability of compounding to exist in the language. And how can it be proved that only compounds with *at* are original, and not also compounds of *out*, as *outlaw*, and of *in*, as *inside*, and of *fore*, as *forenoon*? And what does Dr. Dwight say to compounds of both nouns and verbs, which are very common, as *wash-tub, writing-book, godsend, spendthrift, browbeat, hoodwink*; or of verbs and prepositions, as *goby, foretell*; of two adverbs, as *whereas*; of adjectives and adverbs, as *somehow*; and of such compounds as *nevertheless, moreover, notwithstanding*?

The collection of etymological illustrations is, in the main, very good. They are mostly words of Latin origin only, though sometimes the same roots are traced into the Germanic languages. Dr. Dwight's studies have been mostly in the Latin and Greek, and he views other languages principally as connected with Latin and Greek. It is natural, therefore, that he should consider chiefly the Latin side of the English. This compend of examples will be serviceable to young students, as it will give them truer ideas of the connection between Latin and Greek, and of their relations to the modern languages, than they can obtain in

any of their ordinary lexicons or text-books. But enthusiasm for Sanskrit analogues and for the results of comparative etymology will lead one too far, unless it is balanced by a sound judgment and a habit of questioning and disbelieving appearances. We can see frequent evidences here that the author has been misled by false lights. Take, for example, the word *smile*. We have in Skr. *smi*, and Gr. *μειδιάω*. An initial *σ* is sometimes dropped, so that *μειδιάω* may be for *σμειδιάω*; and as *l* is sometimes interchanged with *d*, the connection with *smile* is obvious. If this were so, we should expect to find the word in some of the other Germanic languages. But it exists only in the Scandinavian. In Danish we have *smile*, and in Swedish we have *smile* and *smilöja*. But this is compounded of *smä*, small, and *le* or *löja*, laugh; so that *smile*, instead of being an analogue of *μειδιάω*, is a contracted form, as if small laugh. Many other and more striking instances might easily be found.

The portion of the book which has evidently cost the most labor is the chapter on Comparative Phonology. Notwithstanding some merits, it is exceedingly untrustworthy, immethodical, and unphilosophical. First, the vowel-systems of the three classical languages are considered, both structurally and pathologically. Then the consonantal systems are treated in the same way, and then follows a special analysis of the Greek and Latin alphabets. By pathology is meant the affections of the letter, — such as variation, addition, suppression, and weakened and strengthened forms.

Phonology, though exhaustively treated by ancient Sanskrit grammarians, has been entirely neglected by later writers until the last few years. The phonology of Greek and Latin is being reduced to shape, but that of the Teutonic tongues, and even of the derived Romance languages, still requires much investigation. Almost nothing has been done with the phonology of the English language. Perhaps the best treatment of it is that in Mätzner's grammar, and this is empirical rather than theoretical. There is this thing to be noticed on this topic, that in Greek any change in the pronunciation was indicated by the spelling. The changes produced by the lengthening of the word at either end, or by the strengthening of it in the middle, were immediately indicated in the form of the word. The English has so long been fixed by printing, that, though now many changes are taking place in the quality and quantity of vowels, produced either by an increase of the word or a change of the accent, we do not notice them. A careful investigation of this subject will lead to many valuable results.

We know that speech is very much influenced by climate, the inhabitants of some regions being unable to produce sounds which are fre-

quent among other peoples. We know, also, that a slight malformation of the mouth alters very much the character of the speech. Children are noted for their imperfect pronunciation. It would be a very interesting subject of inquiry, what are the invariable ways (if any) in which sounds are thus modified, and also how much the defective utterance of prominent individuals may have affected the pronunciation of a nation. The consonantal changes in a child's speech are very similar to some of those which Dr. Dwight gives us in the Greek and Latin, as the substitution of a lingual for a palatal, or *t* for *k*. A child says *tiss me* instead of *kiss me*. So the Greeks said *ris* while the Romans said *quis*.

And though linguals are easily substituted for each other, and the old Latin *t* in *Mutina* has become *d* in *Modena*, it is not so in the English word *decreed*. The final *d* here represents, according to Dr. Dwight, the *t* in *decretum*. To us, however, it seems to be the same *d* found in the past tense of all regular verbs. We are also in several places told that β interchanges with μ , and *vice versa*, and are given $\beta\lambda\acute{o}\sigma\kappa\omega$, and $\beta\rho\acute{o}\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, for $\mu\rho\acute{o}\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, as examples. But the best mode of explaining this is by the insertion of a β and then dropping the μ , and this is admitted by the author in another place. The connection between *m* and *b* is very close, because in opening our mouth after pronouncing *m* we almost involuntarily say *b*. This is seen in the words *dumb* and *lamb*. The letter *b* is stated to be epenthetic in *comburare*; but if not radical here, how can we explain *bustum*, a tomb? Dr. Dwight says that *a* is sometimes euphonic, but that in $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ and $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\nu\eta$ it certainly is not, but for etymological reasons must be radical. But we also have forms in Greek without the *a*, and there is the Skr. *târâ*, Lat. *stella*, Ger. *Stern*, and Eng. *star*. Are there etymological reasons that the *a* is radical? After drawing an elaborate distinction between apocope and echthipsis, in which apocope is defined to be a suppression at the end of a word, most of the examples are of a suppression *near* the end of a word, and some of them are given as examples of echthipsis also. Under the head of Pathological Affections of the Greeks, Dr. Dwight treats of Digamma-tion, Sibilation, Aspiration, Reduplication, and Nasalization. We can understand how the last two are affections; and Aspiration also, because the aspirate is a mere breathing which is very variable. But how is digamma-tion an affection? If it is no peculiar affection of a language to have some words contain a *b* or a *d*, how is it a peculiarity to have words with an *f* in them? Why not *betation* and *deltation*? The peculiarity consists in losing the digamma.

Under Aspiration, in classing languages according to their richness in aspirates, the author puts Sanskrit at the beginning, and the Slavic languages at the end of the scale, these being, he says, "nearly wanting in

aspirates of every kind." We are at a loss how he came to make such a wild statement as this, for, though deficient in *th* and using *h* but little, they have a great number of aspirates, especially of peculiar sibilant-aspirates. In Russian *g* is sometimes pronounced *h* and *gh*, and there are, besides, *zh*, *tch*, *sch*, *schtch*, *ch* (hard), *ph*, and *s* (the sounds, as below, being here indicated in English letters). In Bohemian we have *f*, *h*, *s*, *tch*, *sh*, *zh*, *rz*, and *ch* hard. And the Polish use *tsh*, *tch*, *ch* (hard), *f*, *h*, *rz*, *sh*, *zh*, and *s*. Here is an abundance of aspirates. And not only are they numerous, but they are frequently used. We here take occasion to say, that a study of the Slavic languages would be of great benefit to a philological student. They stand next and not far off in usefulness to the Sanskrit. In them we see languages fuller in forms than the Greek or Latin, which are now in life and use, and we begin to realize how Latin was spoken. So in the study of phonology especially they offer great benefits. We are yet not sorry that Dr. Dwight has written this chapter on Phonology; for it will interest many who have not studied the subject before, and incite them to investigate it to a greater extent. But we hope that all will read it with great caution, trusting little and doubting much.

We wish we could speak well of Dr. Dwight's style, but it is not only inflated, overloaded, frequently careless and confused, but occasionally ungrammatical. The punctuation of his sentences is most wretched, and there is often the greatest difficulty in picking out the meaning. The subject is not only separated from the verb by commas, but often by semicolons or colons, and sometimes by all three. There is hardly a page that is not disfigured in this way. Whether Dr. Dwight has a peculiar theory of punctuation, we do not know; but if he has, he owes it to his readers to set it forth.

6. — *Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution. With an Historical Essay.* By LORENZO SABINE. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1864. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. xii. and 608, 600.

ON the first publication of Mr. Sabine's elaborate work on "The American Loyalists," as it was then denominated, the general subject of which it treats was discussed at length in this journal; and very little need be added to what was then written.* Our present remarks, therefore, will be confined to a notice of the changes which have been introduced in the enlarged and revised edition now before us, and to some further observations on the manner in which the author has exe-

* N. A. Review, No. 136, Art. VI.